



Advisory Letter on Development of Merit Pay Criteria Documents

October 11, 2010

Committee on Merit Pay Criteria, seated by AAUP-UC Executive Council on 9/28/10

Elise Cowie, Assistant Professor of Clinical, Nutritional Science (AHS)

Steve Howe, Ph.D., Professor, Psychology (A&S)

Holly Johnson, Ph.D, Associate Professor, Education (CECH)

Ron Jones, Associate Librarian (Law Library)

Louis Kutcher, Assistant Professor, Biology (RWC)

Daniel Langmeyer, Ph.D, Adjunct Professor, Psychology (A&S)

Rick Paul, Professor, Molecular & Cell Physiology (COM)

Deborah Herman (Executive Director, AAUP-UC Chapter)

Advisory Letter on Development of Merit Pay Criteria Documents

The Merit Pay Program

1. Philosophy & Purpose of the Program (p. 3)
2. The Merit Program vs. Article 15 Increases (p. 3)
3. A Different Timeframe (p. 4)
4. Overview of Faculty Role in Merit Pay Process (p. 4)

Developing the Merit Pay Criteria Document

1. Decision-making in Development of the Merit Pay Criteria Document (p. 5)
2. Developing Band Descriptors (p. 5)

The Work of the Faculty Merit Pay Committee

1. Electing the Faculty Review Committee or Faculty Appeals Committee (p. 7)
2. The Importance of Documentation (p. 7)
 - Annual Performance Review
 - Curriculum Vitae
 - Workload Document or Faculty Statement of Activities
3. Applying the Criteria (p.9)
4. Issuing the Band Assignments (p. 10)
5. Merit Pay Awards Schedule (p. 10)

In Closing (p. 10)

Appendices

- Appendix A – College of Arts & Sciences Faculty Annual Report (p.11)
Appendix B – UC Libraries Activity Report (p. 16)
Appendix C – School of Education (CECH) Faculty Work Reflections (p. 18)

The Merit Pay Program

1. Philosophy and Purpose of the Program

Although merit pay has been a feature of a few collective bargaining agreements during this Chapter's 35-year history, most recently in the 1995-1998 agreement, those previous merit pay systems bear only superficial resemblance to the merit pay program outlined in the new 2010-2013 collective bargaining agreement. For example, while both the new merit pay system and at least one of its predecessors call for Faculty Members in each academic unit to develop criteria for awarding merit pay, they differ sharply in their *application* of these merit pay criteria. And, unlike previous "one-time" merit programs, this one is designed to be an ongoing program that can carry into future contracts.

Whereas previous merit pay programs did not require Faculty Members to measure their peers' performance in accordance with any particular scale, the new merit pay system *requires* such a measurement, mandating that Faculty Members be assigned to one of three bands: 0, 1x and 2x. Moreover, unlike previous merit pay programs, the new merit pay system prohibits academic units from placing all of their Faculty Members in one band, instead requiring that Faculty Members be placed in at least two bands. In other words, all of the Faculty Members in an academic unit cannot receive the same band assignment (thus resulting effectively in an across-the-board increase), and therefore will not receive the same merit increase.

With this new system, then, it is more important than ever that each academic unit develop a clear merit pay criteria document that takes into account the varying foci and assignments of all of the unit's Faculty Members. As we all begin the process of preparing these new merit pay criteria documents in our academic units, then, it is important to keep in mind what merit pay is under this new system – and what it is not.

Two notes: throughout this advisory letter, we will differentiate between the "merit pay criteria document" (which might include a statement of philosophy or other text deemed important to include), and the "band descriptors" (more narrowly, the descriptions assigned to each of the three bands).

Also, we use the capitalized term "Faculty Member" to indicate part-time and full-time members of the faculty who are part of the AAUP-UC bargaining unit. Faculty who are not in the bargaining unit are not eligible to participate in this process.

2. The Merit Program vs. Article 15 Increases

The merit pay system newly established in Article 10 and the system for providing additional compensation under Article 15 now serve clearly different purposes. Merit pay is intended to reward "**ongoing excellence** in teaching, research, and service to the University and the community" (Article 10.3.1) (emphasis added). In other words, merit pay is oriented toward recognizing and rewarding Faculty Members' continuous excellence in the performance of their regular duties. By contrast, Article 15 awards are designed to reward "**outstanding** professional contributions," and in fact, Article 15

states that “such professional contributions are **clearly above and beyond those typically recognized through a merit increase program.**” (This is not new language in Article 15, by the way; it has been there in this form for many years.)

3. A Different Timeframe

The merit pay system under Article 10 calls for a review of Faculty Members’ performances from a very different time perspective than that embodied in Article 7 (Reappointment, Promotion & Tenure). Whereas the consideration of a Faculty Member’s performance in a review for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure involves a look at the Faculty Member’s progress toward those goals or along a career trajectory, and frequently involves an assessment of that Faculty Member’s work over two or more years, an evaluation for merit pay must focus upon the Faculty Member’s immediate past performance, i.e., the preceding year. (Note: in some academic units, because of their APR calendars, it’s possible that in this start-up year some Faculty Members’ Year 1 and Year 2 reviews will cover the same APR period. Once the system is in place, this will not happen again in the future.)

4. Overview of Faculty Role in the Merit Pay Process

“Year 1” merit awards will be decided by each Dean, in accordance with the Council of Deans’ criteria, and will become effective mid-year 2010-2011. The process of Faculty Members determining Year 2 merit awards (to be paid September 1, 2011) begins now. Faculty Members in each academic unit must:

- Develop a merit pay criteria document, including band descriptors;
- Decide whether a faculty committee or the academic unit head will make the initial band assignments; and
- Submit the merit pay criteria document and the decision on which review system will be used to the Dean (with a copy to the AAUP office) for approval by **December 1, 2010**.

The Dean will forward all merit pay criteria documents and decisions on review system to the Provost’s office. Documents may be returned by the Provost to the academic unit Faculty Members for revisions. Approval of the merit pay criteria document is due from the Provost by **January 15, 2011**.

If the Faculty Review Committee system was chosen, the committee must then determine initial band assignments for Faculty Members in accordance with the approved merit pay criteria document.

Finally, the Committee will notify individual Faculty Members, the Dean and the Provost of the initial band assignments for each Faculty Member by **February 15, 2011**.

If Faculty Members choose the system under which the elected committee members compose the Faculty Appeals Committee, the unit head makes the initial band assignments, and the committee will hear appeals and issue decisions between February 15, 2011 and March 15, 2011. In either system, the academic unit head is placed into a band by the Provost, in consultation with his/her Dean.

A final comment on process: The Executive Council is aware that the “start-up period” will require extra work and may at first glance be confusing. This system was designed and negotiated in response to a large number of Faculty Members’ expressed desire to try a merit pay program again, their opinions about the deficiencies of earlier merit programs, and their desire to have a strong faculty role in the process. We believe that the system will become easier to manage and far less time-consuming once merit pay criteria documents are finalized and Faculty Members have had the chance to go through a round of awards.

Developing the Merit Pay Criteria Document

1. Decision-making in Development of the Merit Pay Criteria Document

The new contract does not place any restrictions on how the Faculty Members in each academic unit are to go about developing the merit pay criteria document.

Probably the most obvious way that units can develop this document is to seat a committee to prepare a draft. While there are no rules about it, we recommend that faculty consider carefully the need to include all faculty perspectives or focus areas on the committee. This may or may not mean “reserving a seat” on the committee for various types of Faculty Members.

In seating the committee, we recommend that faculty agree explicitly among themselves whether this committee is empowered to make a draft, circulate it for comments, and then of its own accord finalize the document; or whether the committee is to make a draft, circulate it for comments, and then bring it back to a faculty meeting for a vote. Either method is acceptable, and one or the other may be preferable in your academic unit; the important thing is to agree up front exactly what the method of approving the final document will be.

2. Developing Band Descriptors

The contract sets out two rules concerning the development of the merit pay criteria document and the bands:

The Faculty Members of the individual Academic Units shall develop merit criteria consistent with their unit’s RPT criteria. (Article 10.4.3)

The criteria must recognize teaching, research, and service as areas of endeavor to be considered in the award of merit increases. (Article 10.4.3)

As noted above, this process should *not* be duplicative of the RPT review process. While the document and band descriptors should be grounded in your department's RPT document, the Faculty Review Committee or unit head need not (and probably should not) themselves attempt to make in-depth, substantive, qualitative judgments about a Faculty Member's performance over the previous year.

Instead, the Faculty Review Committee members or unit head need only compare the documents submitted with the band descriptor to see which band best fits, based on the qualitative and quantitative evidence before them.

The band descriptors, therefore, need not be detailed; they need only *reference* the expectations established in the academic unit's RPT document and workload document (if any).

In designing the merit pay criteria document and band descriptors, Faculty Members should keep in mind that the unit head or Faculty Review Committee is required to utilize *at least* two of the three bands in the initial band assignments. How widely or narrowly merit awards are distributed among Faculty Members will largely be a function of how Faculty Members agree to describe the bands.

Band descriptors could be as simple as this:

- 2x Performance in the review period significantly exceeds that expected for a Faculty Member with his/her rank and assignments.
- 1x Performance in the review period meets expectations for a Faculty Member with his/her rank and assignments.
- 0 No evidence was presented by the Faculty Member; or, the evidence presented did not establish that expectations for a Faculty Member with his/her rank and assignments were met.

This approach would, in most academic units, lead to a fairly broad distribution of merit awards. Faculty Members are completely free to design descriptors that take a different approach, one that defines "ongoing excellence" in a more narrow sense which would then result in a more narrow distribution of awards.

Finally, in composing your merit pay criteria document, Faculty Members may choose to elaborate the band descriptors beyond the above example. If so, the descriptors must be flexible enough to encompass the focus and assignments of *all* Faculty Members in the unit and, as noted above, must take into account teaching, research, and service in relation to the Faculty Member's assigned duties and/or job description. In units with both tenure-track and off-tenure-track Faculty Members, it is also possible to create two sets of descriptors. We caution, however, that very detailed or elaborated band descriptors might have the unintended effect of drawing the Faculty Review Committee or unit head toward duplication of the RPT review or APR processes, which is unnecessary and not the intent of the merit program.

We believe that the simpler the merit band descriptors are, and the more they express concepts rather than checklists, the easier the decision-making process will be.

The Work of the Faculty Merit Pay Committee

1. Electing the Faculty Review Committee or Faculty Appeals Committee

As noted above, Faculty Members in the academic unit must “democratically select” which system they want to use: initial review by an elected faculty committee (referred to in this document as the Faculty Review Committee), with appeals heard by the unit head; or initial review by the unit head with appeals heard by an elected faculty committee (referred to in this document as the Faculty Appeals Committee). Regardless of which system the academic unit Faculty Members choose, the number and method of election of committee members (Review or Appeals) is the same:

. . . . the faculty committee shall be democratically elected by the Faculty Members of the Academic Unit and shall be composed of no fewer than three (3) and no more than seven (7) Bargaining Unit Faculty Members. (Article 10.4.6.2)

As noted above, academic unit faculty must decide which system they prefer and inform the Dean, Provost, and AAUP of their decision no later than December 1, 2010.

We encourage Faculty Members to elect the faculty committee (Review or Appeals) immediately after informing the Dean, Provost, and AAUP of your system selection. You may or may not wish to hold off on the election until you have completed and submitted your merit pay criteria document, but in all cases, we recommend you elect this committee as soon as possible. This will allow the committee members time to consider their task and ask for clarification if necessary before beginning their work, which must be completed in the case of Faculty Review Committees between January 15, 2011 and February 15, 2011, and in the case of Faculty Appeals Committees between February 15, 2011 and March 15, 2011.

2. The Importance of Documentation

The three documents to be considered by the Faculty Review Committee or unit head are the Annual Performance Review (APR), the Faculty Member’s most recent curriculum vitae, and the workload document or faculty statement of activities (if any).

Given the centrality of these documents, it is now more important than ever that academic unit Faculty Members consider the processes used to produce the Annual Performance Review and the workload document or annual faculty report on activities.

- **Annual Performance Review**

We urge Faculty Members and academic unit heads to review the *AAUP White Paper on Annual Performance Reviews* (available at <http://aaupuc.org>). It lays out best

practices that can provide Faculty Members with a substantive Annual Performance Review while minimizing, as much as possible, the time required of the academic unit head to produce these reviews.

We have seen examples of APRs that indicate these practices have already been in use in many departments for a long time, but many other departments would benefit from considering these best practices and making modifications. From this point forward, two- or three-line APRs will not be sufficient documentation given the merit program's reliance on this document.

Faculty Members who disagree with part or all of an academic unit head's assessment in the Annual Performance Review are encouraged to discuss the review with him/her. If agreement cannot be reached after discussion, the Faculty Member has the right to compose a response and have it attached to the APR. If a response is attached to the APR, the Faculty Review Committee or unit head should take the response into account when making band assignments.

- **Curriculum Vitae**

Because this merit program is designed to review a short period of time, not the entire trajectory of a Faculty Member's career, it may only be necessary to provide a "short version" of the C.V. to the Faculty Review Committee or unit head.

- **Workload Document or Faculty Statement of Activities (optional)**

All colleges have "workload guidelines" dating back to 1994 (see *AAUP White Paper on Annual Performance Reviews*, available at <http://aaupuc.org>, for a brief history of these documents). In many cases, however, these college-level documents are not detailed and are not of much help in the day-to-day work of an academic unit.

Many colleges and academic units have therefore created a form that allows Faculty Members to report on their activities over the past year as a means of planning for the next (see, for example, Appendix A, "College of Arts & Sciences Faculty Annual Report," and Appendix B, "UC Libraries Activity Report"). Some academic units have also produced department-level workload guidelines, which is contractually appropriate so long as the faculty and the college administration have both agreed to the document, and so long as the unit-level documents comport with the college workload guidelines.

While workload or activities reports of some kind are not a required piece of documentation for the merit pay process, we believe that, when done well, they can form the basis of a *faculty-driven overview* of performance over the past year which can inform the Annual Performance Review (see, for example, Appendix C, "School of Education (CECH) Faculty Work Reflections;" more examples of workload documents and faculty activity reports are available in the *AAUP White Paper on Annual Performance Reviews*).

3. Applying the Criteria

Ground Yourself in the Unit Documents

The Faculty Review Committee or unit head knows well his/her own department's RPT criteria, mission, and workload expectations. We believe that, with a thorough knowledge of those documents in the background, in most cases the comparison of the Faculty Member's documentation to the band descriptors will not be extremely difficult.

Rationales for Decisions?

In the initial review or in the case of an appeal, no rationale, explanation, or defense of the initial band assignments or appeal decision are required from the Faculty Review Committee, Faculty Appeals Committee, or unit head. While it is not prohibited in the contract, we urge Faculty Members and unit heads not to attach such rationales. We urge you to avoid it because, first, it is unnecessary (the rationale is inherent in the band descriptors); and second, because it probably will lead you down the road of replicating the RPT review process.

The RPT review process is set up, especially at the unit RPT committee and unit head levels, to provide *substantive* judgments and feedback to the faculty member with an eye toward future growth toward reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. The merit award process is not intended for that purpose. Substantive judgments on performance should already be embodied in the APR and the workload document, while the C.V. provides a kind of quantitative evidence. There is no need, therefore, for the Faculty Review Committee or unit head to make substantive judgments on performance; that has already been done. Their task is instead to compare the substantive judgments already made to the band descriptors.

How to Consider Long-Term Projects?

Because the merit program is designed to review a short period of time, there is the risk of ignoring a Faculty Member's ongoing work on a long-term project. In writing up activity reports or updating the C.V., Faculty Members should consider all the ways they typically demonstrate, share, and seek review of ongoing, long-term projects. The Faculty Review Committee or unit head should then, in making the initial band assignments, give proper credit for items such as: obtaining a grant or contract; peer-reviewed or invited presentations that discuss sections of an in-process monograph or research, or journal articles derived from chapters of an in-process monograph or preliminary results of an in-process research project. This makes perfect sense so long as we all keep in mind that this merit award system is set up to reward "ongoing excellence," not the production of a discrete item.

What If the Documents Are Not In Sync?

In rare cases you may find a Faculty Member's APR, C.V. and workload document or faculty statement of activities are not in sync with each other, and/or the Faculty Member and the unit head have disagreed on the substance of the APR (i.e., the Faculty Member has attached a response). The 2010-2013 contract does not provide direction on how to handle such cases; therefore, it is up to the Faculty Review Committee or Faculty Appeals Committee or unit head to weigh the documents and use their best judgment.

How Will Members of the Faculty Review Committee Rate Themselves?

In academic units which have chosen the Faculty Review system (with the unit head to hear appeals), the Faculty Members comprising the committee will, of necessity, be required to place themselves into a band.

This is not fundamentally different from situations such as when Faculty Members must decide on a fellow committee member's request for travel funds. Members of the Faculty Review Committee should decide ahead of time how they'll handle this task.

All Faculty Members should keep in mind that the Provost does have the authority, if necessary and with good reason, to change an individual band assignment; thus, there is a kind of "check" on committee members' decisions on their own band placement.

4. Issuing the Band Assignments

As noted above, the Faculty Review Committee or academic unit head must notify each individual Faculty Member, and the Dean and Provost's office of their initial band assignments no later than February 15, 2011.

Faculty Members who wish to file an appeal of their band assignment must do so by March 1, 2011, and include a rationale (i.e., why the evidence submitted does not fit the band descriptor as assigned) for the appeal along with copies of the APR, C.V. and workload document, if available.

Appeals must be reviewed (by the Faculty Appeals Committee or the unit head) and decisions issued by March 15, 2011.

5. Merit Pay Awards Schedule

Merit awards, as finalized by the Provost, will be added to the Faculty Members' base salaries as of September 1, 2011.

Likewise, merit awards finalized in the Spring 2012 period will be added to base salaries as of September 1, 2012.

In Closing

This advisory letter is not a substitute for the contractual language itself, but we hope you will find it a useful supplement. You can read the contract language directly by downloading a copy from the AAUP website (<http://aaupuc.org/contract.html>). The contract language on the merit pay system begins with Article 10.3 (p. 61).

If you have further questions about contract language interpretation or procedural details, feel free to contact the AAUP Chapter office (556-6861).

APPENDIX A

COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI McMicken College of Arts & Sciences Faculty Annual Report PERIOD REPORTED

Name:

Department:

Academic rank and title:

Directions: Please follow the format as closely as possible. Read it fully before you begin. If a category does not apply to you for this report, please leave it blank. No one format will fit all of the faculty of the college completely, so reasonable adaptations of certain categories may be necessary. Avoid repetition by using cross-referencing.

The annual report should list information on the following categories for the reporting period.

I. Teaching and Academic Advising

A. All courses taught in the reporting period. Use one line for each course taught in tabular format as indicated. Add or delete rows as necessary. If the same course was taught more than once, each section should be placed on its own line. Do not list independent studies directed here, but below in subsection E. Attach summaries of student evaluations at the back of this report. Provide your department's average overall score here, if your department requires it: _____.

Term	Course Name	Course Designator and Number	Class Size	Number of Respondents	Credits

B. Any other evaluations of instruction that you wish to include.

C. The student names and titles of undergraduate research projects and honors theses directed. You may also include special achievements of undergraduate students.

D. The names of doctoral graduates, titles of dissertations, and current positions held (if known) who graduated during the reporting period. Do the same for master graduates with theses. You may also include special achievements of graduate students.

E. A chronological list of independent studies, field studies, special studies and internships directed.

F. Academic advising responsibilities. List the number of undergraduate and graduate advisees by academic level and the number of graduate student committees on which you serve. You may also briefly list such activities as assisting with job placement, writing letters of recommendation, and continuing advising relations with former students, and include any evidence of advising effectiveness.

G. Course, curriculum, and program development. List new courses developed and old courses revised. You may also briefly list special features of the course(s), including matters pertaining to service learning, multicultural or international content, or integration of technology.

H. Demonstrated efforts to evaluate or improve one's teaching effectiveness. This may include any pertinent workshops or conferences that you have attended.

I. Guest lectures given in colleagues' classes.

J. Recognitions, honors, or awards for teaching or academic advising effectiveness.

K. If you care to comment on any matters related to your teaching or academic advising during the reporting period, do so here. Limit your comments to no more than 250 words.

II. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Achievements

A. Research and scholarly publications according to the subdivisions listed below. Distinguish whether items were published or accepted during the reporting period. (Note that work currently under submission and being reviewed and work in progress should be listed in section V.)

1. Books or monographs authored.
2. Book chapters.
3. Books edited.
4. Textbooks authored.
5. Textbooks edited.
6. Papers in refereed or peer-reviewed journals (including electronic peer-reviewed journals).

7. Papers in refereed or peer-reviewed conference proceedings (including electronic peer-reviewed proceedings).
8. Prefaces, introductions, catalogue statements, etc.
9. Entries in reference works.
10. Papers presented at professional meetings.
11. Other papers and reports, including non-refereed online publications.
12. Abstracts.
13. Translations.
14. Reviews of published works (e.g., books, CDs).
15. Sponsored research and other grants and awards. Cite principal investigator(s) explicitly, as well as all names that appear on the grant proposal, year, duration of award, source (agency) of the award, and the amount. Indicate your level of responsibility.

B. Creative publications, performances, exhibitions, and compositions according to the subdivisions listed below. Distinguish whether items were published / performed or accepted during the reporting period.

1. Novels and books (e.g., collections of essays, poems, short stories, etc.).
2. Poems, plays, essays, musical scores.
3. Performances, productions, films, videos, and exhibitions. Indicate venue, scale, and method of selection.
4. Newspaper and magazine articles.
5. Competitions and commissions.
6. Reviews of published works (e.g., books, CDs).
7. Grant applications and awards. Cite principal investigator(s) explicitly, as well as all names that appear on the grant proposal, year, duration of award, source (agency) of the award, and the amount. Indicate your level of responsibility.

C. Editorships, curatorships, etc. according to the subdivisions listed below.

1. Journals or other scholarly publications.
2. Editorial boards.
3. Exhibitions, performances, displays, etc.

D. Software and patents.

E. Demonstrated efforts to develop skills pertaining to one's research. This may include any pertinent workshops or conferences that you have attended.

F. Recognitions, honors, or awards connected to your research, scholarly, or creative activities.

G. If you care to comment on any matters related to your research, scholarly, or creative activities during the reporting period, do so here. Limit your comments to no more than 250 words.

III. Outreach and Public Service Accomplishments

A. Specific outreach responsibilities.

B. Public service and outreach.

1. Development activities.
2. Educational activities.
3. Community presentations.
4. Consultantships.
 - a. Non-paid.
 - b. Paid.
5. Professional development programs.
6. Other.

C. Outreach publications.

1. Books and book chapters.
2. Numbered Extension publications.
3. Brochures and fact sheets.
4. Magazines, newspapers, newsletters, and popular publications.
5. Extension reports.
6. Teaching and resource materials.
7. Media presentations.

D. Results of participant and peer evaluations concerning the significance and impact of programs.

1. Evaluations from program participants.
2. Impact evaluations and adoption of outreach education programs.
3. Peer reviews.

E. Demonstrated efforts to develop skill pertaining to outreach activities. This may include any pertinent workshops or conferences that you have attended.

F. List any recognitions, honors, or awards connected to your outreach professional activities.

G. If you care to comment on any matters related to your outreach professional activities during the reporting period, do so here. Limit your comments to no more than 250 words.

IV. Professional and University Service

A. Service as an officer of an academic or professional association.

B. Other service to one's profession or field (e.g., committee membership, development of programs, assisting colleagues).

C. Meetings, panels, workshops, etc. led or organized.

D. Manuscripts, grant proposals, and exhibitions reviewed or juried for presses, journals, societies, or funding agencies.

E. University, college, and department service (e.g., committee membership, hosting visitors, organizing lectures and lecture series, recruitment, mentoring).

1. University.
2. College.
3. Department.

F. Service to students (e.g., involvement in co-curricular activities, advising student organizations).

G. Recognitions, honors, or awards connected to your professional and university service.

H. Contributions to the university's diversity goals.

I. If you care to comment on any matters related to your professional or university service during the reporting period, do so here. Limit your comments to no more than 250 words.

V. Additional information not reflected in above categories

A. Work currently submitted and being reviewed, including grant applications.

B. Work in progress.

C. Other relevant and important activities not reflected elsewhere in this report.

VI. Goals and objectives for next reporting period

A. List briefly, as relevant, the direction of, or goals for, your work in the coming academic year in:

1. Teaching activities.
2. Research, scholarly, and creative works.
3. Outreach and service activities.
4. Other professional activities.
5. Professional development.

B. Indicate how the department/college might assist you in your work and/or professional development. Limit your comments to no more than 250 words.

APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI LIBRARIES

LIBRARIAN'S ACTIVITY REPORT

2007-2008

NAME: _____ DATE: _____

I. Job-Related Accomplishments

- A. List accomplishments in areas of responsibility outlined in your current job description; e.g. reference service, cataloging, library instruction, collection management, acquisitions, administration, supervision.
- B. Briefly describe any major accomplishment(s) including activities in support of the Strategic Plan and/or assumption of duties outside your job description.

II. Scholarly or Professional Accomplishments, including Professional Development and Professional Service Activities

- A. List participation in University Libraries committees and briefly describe your contributions.
- B. List participation in University committees and briefly describe your contributions.
- C. List participation in professional organizations and briefly describe your contributions.
- D. International, national, state or regional recognition or accomplishments: list professional recognition or accomplishments not covered in II.C.
- E. Contributions to scholarship not covered above.
- F. Professional development and continuing education. List educational and training activities, which contributed to your professional development.

**UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
LIBRARIAN'S INDIVIDUAL GOALS
PERIOD: 2007-2008**

NAME: _____

DATE: _____

1. Individual goals for the coming year.
(Please indicate how these individual goals are tied to your department goals and the Strategic Plan.)

**PERFORMANCE REVIEW
CERTIFICATION**

A performance review has been completed and reviewed by the supervisor and the employee on the date noted below:

Employee's signature

Supervisor's signature

Date

APPENDIX C

DIVISION OF TEACHER EDUCATION (CECH)

University of Cincinnati - Division of Teacher Education Faculty Work Reflection for 2007-2008

Name: _____ Primary Program Assignment: _____

Directions: Complete a reflection by either using this template or one that addresses the three areas of scholarship, teaching, and service for the 2007-2008 year. Consult your workload statement from the Fall term and discuss how your actual work corresponded to or diverged from your workload plans.

TEACHING

TOTAL WORK LOAD UNITS _____

Course No.	Course Title	Credits	Yr/Qtr

Mentoring/Graduate Committees

List and discuss activities during the last academic year, including doctoral committees – names of students, role (chair or member), status (e.g., dissertation stage), and Master’s Project/Thesis committees – names of students, role, status

SCHOLARSHIP

TOTAL WORK LOAD UNITS_____

List and discuss activities during the last academic year, including publications, including submissions and revisions; presentations to be given at academic conferences, and; research grants developed/submitted

SERVICE

TOTAL WORK LOAD UNITS_____

List and discuss activities during the last academic year, including service to profession (e.g., offices/committees; reviewer; other services to local, regional, or national professional organizations etc.); service to program and division (creation and grading of comprehensive exams, program development/coordination activities; committee service; peer reviewer; preparation of accreditation/formal reviews or reports); service to college and university (e.g., elected/appointed positions; committees), and; community service (including workshops for practitioners).

I am submitting this annual reflection as an accurate portrayal of my work for 2007-2008 and agree that it represents how I fulfilled my goals and responsibilities from my Work Statement for the 2007-08 academic year.

Faculty Signature

Date

University of Cincinnati - Division of Teacher Education
 Faculty Work Statement for 2008-2009

Name
Title of Faculty Member

Primary program assignment: Teacher Education

Faculty are expected to carry out all program responsibilities including but not limited to:

- attending and participating meaningfully in all program meetings;
- attending program functions;
- attending and representing the program at designated college and university functions;
- serving meaningfully on program, college and university committees;
- providing program and advising information to prospective admitted students;
- meeting all assigned instructional and supervision responsibilities;
- completing and administering program-related data inquiries and other requested information

A unit of work, a "workload unit" (WLU), is defined as 2.5 to 3 hours per week across one term

Teaching

() WLU

Autumn	Winter	Spring

Advising (Approximate the number of students _____.)

___ WLU

Serving on active graduate committees:

Office hours; 2.5 hours per week to advise walk-in candidates for the program and potential applicants to our graduate programs.

Posted advising/office hours:

Scholarship (Include plans for research, publications, presentations, and grant proposals)___ WLU

Presentations:

Research and Publication:

Grant Work:

Service

___ WLU

College/Department:

University Related:

Professional Organization:

Describe Your Plans to Work With Area Schools:

Program Development:

Requests for Special Resources/Travel Resources (List needs for achieving these goals.)

Summary of Work Statement (WLUs)

	Autumn 2007	Winter 2008	Spring 2008	TOTAL
Teaching				
Research/Scholarship				
Service				
Total				42

We have reviewed this work statement and agree that it represents my responsibilities for the 2008-2009 academic year.

Faculty Name

Dr. Holly Johnson

DATE: _____